

REMARKS

In the present Office Action, the Examiner has (a) determined that claims 1-36 are subject to a restriction requirement; and (b) required restriction to one of the following inventions – Group I: claims 1-9, drawn to a power distribution system, classified in class 361; Group II: claims 10-17, drawn to an aircraft, classified in class 244; and Group III: claims 18-36, drawn to a method of providing power, classified in class 297.

Applicants hereby provisionally elect to prosecute the claims of Group II (claims 10-17) in the above-identified case, but traverse the restriction requirement with respect to the claims of Groups I and III (claims 1-9 and 18-36).

TRAVERSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

As set forth in the MPEP § 803, restriction may properly be required between patentably distinct inventions if (1) the inventions are independent or distinct as claimed; and (2) there is a serious burden on the Examiner if restriction is not required.


With regard to the claims of Groups II and I in the present case, the Examiner has stated that the inventions are related as combination and subcombination and are distinct under the requirements of MPEP § 806.05(c). With regard to the claims of Groups I and III in the present case, the Examiner has stated the inventions are related as product and process of use and are distinct under the requirements of MPEP § 806.05(h). With regard to the claims of Groups III and II in the present case, the Examiner has stated that the inventions are related as product and process of use and are distinct under the requirements of MPEP § 806.05(h). However, Applicants

respectfully submit that there will not be a serious burden on the Examiner if restriction between the claims directed to a power distribution system, claims directed to an aircraft, and claims directed to a method of providing power is not required regardless of which set of claims are prosecuted. The field of search for each invention is so closely related that maintaining them in the same application would not cause undue hardship for the Examiner. It is respectfully submitted that pertinent art for all three groups may exist in the classes recited by the Examiner. Thus, Applicants contend that there will not be a serious burden on the Examiner if restriction is not required and withdrawal of the restriction requirement is requested.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the conditions set forth in the MPEP § 803 do not require that the invention of Groups I, II and III be restricted in this case, because in particular, there will not be a serious burden on the Examiner if restriction is not required. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the restriction requirement as to the claims of Groups I, II and III and pass this application for action on the merits of the pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 18, 2005

By: 
Jeffrey H. Urian, Reg. No. 46,232

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

JHU/ps